

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/816,816	03/22/2001	Alejandro Wiechers	10003930-1	6165

7590 08/02/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2179

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/816,816	WIECHERS ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Doug Hutton	<b>Art Unit</b> 2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03222001.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Sturgeon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,466,336.

*Claim 1:*

Sturgeon discloses a document processing system for providing information corresponding to a scanned document (see Figures 1-4; see Column 1, Lines 6-12 – the document handling system discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text), said document processing system comprising:

- a scan review system configured for receiving scan information corresponding to a scanned document (see Figure 1), said scan review system being configured to enable selection of a registration characteristic of a page of a document to be scanned and review the document to be scanned relative to the selected registration characteristic such that, in response to identifying a page of the document as not possessing the selected registration characteristic, said scan

review system designates the page for review (see Figures 1-4; see Column 2, Lines 16-45; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 13 – the document handling system discloses this limitation in that it permits the user to identify page designations through a user interface and identify misfed pages based upon the page designations).

*Claim 2:*

Sturgeon discloses the document processing system of Claim 1, further comprising:

- a scanner communicatively coupled to said scan review system, said scanner being configured to receive the document to be scanned and convert printed information of each page of the document into scan information, the scan information being provided in an electronic format to said scan review system (see Figure 1; see Column 3, Lines 21-27 – the document handling system discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure and text).

*Claim 3:*

Sturgeon discloses the document processing system of Claim 1, wherein said scan review system is configured to provide a graphical user interface, said graphical user interface being configured to enable selection of the registration characteristic (see Figure 1; see Column 3, Lines 21-27; see Column 3, Lines 50-56; see Column 4, Lines 62-67 – the document handling system discloses this limitation in that it includes a

scanner with a user interface for inputting instructions for performing the batch scanning job; also, the computer system includes a monitor, keyboard and mouse for "receiving data representative of both operational instructions or parameters," as expressly disclosed in Sturgeon; this disclosure implies that the document handling system includes a "graphical user interface").

*Claim 4:*

Sturgeon discloses the document processing system of Claim 1, wherein said scan review system comprises means for enabling selection of the registration characteristic (as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 3, the document handling system discloses this limitation).

*Claim 5:*

Sturgeon discloses the document processing system of Claim 1, wherein the registration characteristic is at least one of top line, top margin, bottom line, bottom margin, left margin, right margin, and page number (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, the document handling system discloses a "page number" registration characteristic).

*Claim 6:*

Sturgeon discloses the document processing system of Claim 1, wherein said scan review system is configured to determine a page number of each page of a

document to be scanned and to designate scan information corresponding to pages of the document that are not scanned in page order (see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 9, Line 35 – the document handling system discloses this limitation in that it locates the page number for each page and employs optical character recognition to flag missing or misfed pages).

*Claim 7:*

Sturgeon discloses the document processing system of Claim 1, wherein said scan review system comprises:

- means for determining a page number of each page of a document to be scanned; and
- means for designating scan information corresponding to pages of the document that are not scanned in page order (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 6, the document handling system discloses these limitations).

*Claim 8:*

Sturgeon discloses the document processing system of Claim 1, wherein said scan review system is configured to generate two files associated with each page of a document to be scanned, a first of said files containing page content information and a second of the files containing page number information, said scan review system being further configured to utilize the page number information to arrange the page content information in page number order (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 6, the

document handling system discloses optical character recognition to identify a page number; also, the document handling system discloses a “first file containing page content information” in that it includes the scanned digital image of the page and a “second file containing number information” in that it includes a text file created through optical character recognition; finally, see Column 9, Lines 14-35 – the document handling system collates the scanned pages, as clearly indicated in the cited text).

*Claim 9:*

Sturgeon discloses the document processing system of Claim 1, wherein said scan review system is embodied on a computer readable medium (see Column 3, Lines 21-45; see Column 4, Lines 53-67 – the document handling system discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text).

*Claim 10:*

Sturgeon discloses the document processing system of Claim 3, wherein said graphical user interface provides a page viewing window configured to display therein scan information corresponding to a page of the document to be scanned (see Column 9, Lines 36-49 – the document handling system discloses this limitation in that it allows the user to view the scanned document).

*Claim 11:*

Sturgeon discloses the document processing system of Claim 9, wherein said scan review system comprises logic configured to designate pages of the document that were not scanned in page order (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 6, the document handling system discloses this limitation).

*Claim 12:*

Sturgeon discloses the document processing system of Claim 10, wherein said graphical user interface is configured to provide an operator with information indicating the pages of the document that were not scanned in page order (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 6, the document handling system discloses this limitation).

*Claim 13:*

Sturgeon discloses the document processing system of Claim 10, wherein said graphical user interface provides a page number field, said page number field being moveable by an operator about said page viewing window such that a location corresponding to a page number of a page to be scanned may be designated, and wherein said scan review system is configured to process scan information located in a vicinity of said page number field to determine the page number of the page (see Column 6, Line 54 through Column 7, Line 30; see Column 8, Lines 15-24 – the document handling system discloses this limitation in that it allows the user to input

possible locations of page numbers and locates the page numbers through optical character recognition).

*Claim 14:*

Sturgeon discloses a method for providing information corresponding to a scanned document comprising the steps of:

- enabling selection of a registration characteristic of a page of the document (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, the document handling system discloses this limitation);
- reviewing pages of the document relative to the selected registration characteristic (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, the document handling system discloses this limitation); and
- enabling receipt of scan information corresponding to the pages of the document (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 2, the document handling system discloses this limitation).

*Claim 15:*

Sturgeon discloses the method of Claim 14, wherein the step of reviewing comprises designating pages not properly exhibiting the selected registration characteristic (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, the document handling system discloses this limitation).

*Claim 16:*

Sturgeon discloses the method of Claim 14, further comprising the steps of: determining whether a current page of the document to be scanned corresponds to an expected page number; and if the current page number does not correspond to the expected page number, designating the current page for review (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 6, the document handling system discloses these limitations).

*Claim 17:*

Sturgeon discloses the method of Claim 14, further comprising the step of preparing an e-file corresponding to the document to be scanned (see Column 4, Lines 41-52 – the document handling system discloses this limitation in that it stores the scanned documents in an archive).

*Claim 18:*

Sturgeon discloses the method of Claim 14, wherein the registration characteristic is at least one of top line, top margin, bottom line, bottom margin, left margin, right margin, and page number (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 5, the document handling system discloses this limitation).

*Claim 19:*

Sturgeon discloses the method of Claim 17, wherein the step of preparing an e-file comprises the steps of:

- generating, for each page scanned, a first file containing page content information;
- generating, for each page scanned, a second file containing page number information, each second file being associated with a respective first file; and
- utilizing the second files so as to arrange the page content information of the first files in page number order (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 8, the document handling system discloses these limitations).

*Claim 20:*

Sturgeon discloses the method of Claim 19, further comprising the steps of:

- identifying pages missing from the e-file (see Column 2, Lines 23-28 – the document handling system discloses this limitation in that it flags missing pages in a batch job);
- scanning the missing pages (see Column 2, Lines 28-29 – the document handling system discloses this limitation in that the user rescans any missing pages); and
- providing page content information associated with the missing pages to the e-file such that the page content information is arranged in page number order (see

Column 2, Lines 30-32 – the document handling system discloses this limitation in that it automatically places all scanned pages in the proper order).

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Yoda, U.S. Patent No. 5,185,821; Sturgeon et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0186242 A1; Liu et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,735,335; and Rangarajan, U.S. Patent No. 5,822,454.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (703) 305-1701. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

WDH  
July 24, 2004



**DOUG HUTTON  
PATENT EXAMINER  
TECH CENTER 2100**